



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,290	01/11/2007	Robert Edward Coleman	33540-US-PCT	2763
1095	7590	03/24/2008	EXAMINER	
NOVARTIS			SZNAIDMAN, MARCOS L	
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3			1611	
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/578,290	COLEMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	MARCOS SZNAIDMAN	1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,5-7,11-13 and 26-28 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 6,12,13 and 27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,5,7,11,26 and 28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4 pages/01/25/08.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to applicant's reply filed on January 25, 2008.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of paclitaxel in the reply filed on January 25, 2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

### ***Status of Claims***

Amendment of claims 7 and 13, and addition of new claim 28 is acknowledged.

Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, and 26-28 are currently pending and are the subject of this office action.

Claims 6, 12-13 and 27 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on January 25, 2008

Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 26 and 28 are presently under examination.

***Priority***

The present application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/13728 filed on 12/02/2004, and claims priority to foreign application: UNITED KINGDOM No. 0328040 filed on 08/04/2003.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jagdev et. al. (British Journal of Cancer (2001) 84:1126-1134.

Claims 1 and recite a pharmaceutical preparation comprising: a) paclitaxel and b) 2-imidazol-1-yl-hydroxyethane-1,1-diphosphonic acid (zoledronic acid).

For claims 1 and 5, Jagdev et. al. teach a composition of paclitaxel and zoledronic acid (see abstract and page 1130, title: combined treatment with zoledronic acid and paclitaxel, ...).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7, 11, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jagdev et. al. (British Journal of Cancer (2001) 84:1126-1134).

Claims 28, 7 and 11 recite a method of treating a patient suffering from breast cancer comprising administering to the patient an effective amount of zoledronic acid, wherein the administration of zoledronic acid is preceded sequentially by a paclitaxel.

For claims 28, 7 and 11, Jagdev et. al. teach the treatment of breast cancer with a combination of zoledronic acid and paclitaxel, which results in synergistic effects on breast cancer cell number and apoptosis (see abstract and page 1130, and section under title: combined treatment with zoledronic acid and paclitaxel, at pharmacologically achievable concentrations, results in synergistic effects on breast cancer cell number and apoptosis). Jagdev et. al. do not teach the sequence of addition of the paclitaxel and zoledronic acid, however this is a parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal amount of each ingredient and the sequence of administration needed to achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, the optimization of ingredient amounts and sequence of administration would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention, thus resulting in the practice of claims 28, 7 and 11 with a reasonable expectation of success.

Claim 26 recites a commercial package comprising a unit dosage of zoledronic acid, and a unit dosage of paclitaxel; together with instructions for administering

sequential unit doses of paclitaxel and zoledronic acid for the treatment of breast cancer.

Jagdev et. al. recite all the limitations of claim 26, except for the packaging and instructions. However packaging known drugs and instructions on how to use them would have been *prima facie* obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, thus resulting in the practice of claim 26 with a reasonable expectation of success.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS SZNAIDMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3498. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward can be reached on 571 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MLS  
March 06, 2008

/Michael P Woodward/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 1615